REMARKS

Claims 2, 7, 9, 14, 16, and 21 are pending in this application. Claims 7, 14 and 21 are allowed. Claims 2, 9 and 16 are rejected. None of the claims are currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 9 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,933,420 (Jaszewski). With regard to the indicator operable to provide an external indication of the signal strength directly from the first access point to a human being, the indication being perceivable by the human being and also being indicative of the signal strength of the second access point, the Office cites the proximity indicator (426) in Figure 4 of Jaszewski. The Office appears to overlook the limitation "directly from the first access point to a human being." Indeed, the Office Action misquotes the claim language by omitting that limitation, instead stating "indication being perceivable by human being."[1] According to Jaszewski, "the network manager 110 collects the received signal strengths information to determine the amount of communications conflict among the access points using their present channel assignments."[2] Then, "the conflict level information is displayed on the network manager's 110 display as shown in FIG. 4."[3] As shown in FIG. 1, the network manager 110 is a distinct device that is connected to the APs via a wired network 100. It follows that the indication of signal strength displayed by the network manager 110 is not "directly from the first access point to a human being." Rather, data is sent indirectly from the APs to a person via the network manager 110 and the wired network 100.

[1] OA at page 2, last paragraph
[2] column 5, lines 13-16
[3] column 8, lines 2-4

The distinction discussed above is not trivial. One practical problem with the Jaszewski system is that the mapping provided by the management station does not always correspond exactly with the actual layout of APs in the building. There are various possible causes for this situation. For example, APs with an intervening obstruction might be inaccurately mapped because signal strength attenuation attributable to the obstruction is interpreted as distance. An installer standing near the APs might recognize this situation. However, even having an installer standing near the AP can be unsatisfactory when APs are inconspicuously mounted, e.g., behind ceiling tiles, because the installer may not easily find the nearby APs to make a judgment call about whether distance or obstruction is affecting interference, and by how much. An installer might resort to installing the new AP and then referring to an updated mapping at the management station to guess how far and in what direction to move the AP. However, this would typically be done iteratively until a reasonable outcome is achieved, i.e., walking back and forth between the AP and the management station. This is time consuming and inconvenient. Indeed, user complaints about the drawbacks of systems such as that taught by Jaszewski are what lead to the present innovation. The better approach is to eliminate or at least reduce the need to refer to the management station by having the AP itself provide an indication such as sound or flashing light to directly show the installer what is happening in the RF domain. This allows one installer to walk around the building with the AP in hand and evaluate the suitability of a location in real-time without reference to a remotely located management station, but rather by looking at or listening to the AP itself. Ironically, Jaszewski represents an example of the problem which the present invention helps to overcome, rather than the claimed solution.

In view of the above, it will be appreciated that claim 2 distinguishes Jaszewski by reciting "an indicator operable to provide an external indication of the signal strength **directly**

from the first access point to a human being, the indication being perceivable by the human being and also being indicative of the signal strength of the second access point." (emphasis added) Similarly, claim 9 distinguishes Jaszewski by reciting "providing on the access point an external indication of the signal strength that is perceptible by a human being, the external indication provided **directly from the first access point to the human being**." (emphasis added) Similarly, claim 16 distinguishes Jaszewski by reciting "logic for causing a human-perceptible external indication of the signal strength, the external indication provided **directly from the first wireless device to the human being**." (emphasis added)

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. Should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

June 17, 2008
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/
Holmes W. Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Anderson Gorecki & Manaras LLP
33 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-4001

Docket No. 160-007
Dd: 6/20/2008